



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,114	02/20/2002	Johann Winderl	MAS-FIN-116	6732

7590 11/20/2002

LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MUNSON, GENE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2811

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/79,114	Applicant(s) J. WENDERL ET AL
Examiner G. MUNSON	Group Art Unit 2811

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ONE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) 1-25 are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All Some* None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper N (s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit 2811

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-17, drawn to a semiconductor device, classified in class 257, subclass 618.
- II. Claims 18-25, drawn to a process for making semiconductor devices, classified in class 438, subclass 460.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case unpatentability of the group I invention would not necessarily imply unpatentability of the group II invention, since the device of the group I invention could be made by processes materially different than those/that of the group II invention, for example, a "semiconductor wafer" could be disposed on a "carrier" before rather than after "sawing track regions" are provided.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and, as shown by the above different classifications, the fields of search are not co-extensive and separate examination would be required, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Munson
(703) 308-4925 or 0956

11/19/02

Gene M. Munson
GENE M. MUNSON
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 2811